

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 and 9-26 are cancelled.

Claims 7-8 and 27-28 are pending in this application.

Claims 7-8 and 27-28 are rejected.

The office action dated August 20, 2008 indicates that claims 7, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Webb US 2004/0257225 and that claim 8 is rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Easely U.S. Patent No. 7.098,784.

The rejections of claims 7 and 8 have been rendered moot by the cancellation of those claims. The '102 rejection of claims 27-28 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 27 recites a system for maintaining security of a cargo container during shipment from an origination point to a destination. The system comprises

means for determining geographic location of the cargo container during shipment from the origination point to the destination; and

a battery-powered container security unit (CSU) for the container, the CSU reporting on status of the cargo container during the shipment, wherein frequency of the reporting is a function of the geographic location of the container.

For instance, the reporting frequency can be reduced if the threat is low (for instance, if the container is at sea on a ship). In contrast, the frequency can be increased if the threat is high (for instance, if the container is parked in a rail yard).

This feature allows battery power of the CSU to be reduced. Reducing battery power, in turn, allows smaller, lighter batteries to be used by the CSU, which reduces the weight of the CSU. Reduced weight, in turn, can reduce the cost of shipping, especially via aircraft.

Webb discloses a position tracking system for tracking a container 20 as it is shipped from one point to another. A communicating intelligent agent (CIA) 22-28 is

connected with the container for monitoring the position and security of the container (paragraph 49, lines 3-6). During transit, the CIAs 22-28 monitor the physical security of the container to detect tampering with the container and to detect chemical, biological and nuclear material therein (paragraph 49, lines 12-15). Security status and position data are sent to a global operations monitoring and analysis center (GOMAC) 50 (paragraph 48, lines 8-12).

Figure 7 of Webb illustrates a communicating intelligent agent 200. The agent 200 includes an antenna 242 for receiving GPS position data (paragraph 68, lines 6-9). The agent 200 also includes a self-contained power source 270 and electronics for allowing the agent to remain in a sleep mode over an extended period of time. (paragraph 69, lines 1-7).

The agent appears to communicate with the GOMAC 50 when a possible violation to the health or integrity of the container is detected (paragraphs 57 and 73). Additional communication appears to occur between loading dock and origination point (paragraph 76 and 77). Status reports may be generated at periodic intervals or upon request (paragraph 98, lines 1-2).

However, Webb does not teach or suggest that frequency of the reporting is a function of the geographic location of the container.

The office action cites paragraphs 73, 78, 84 and 98 and alleges that these paragraphs suggest that reporting is a function of geographic location. However, none of these paragraphs support the allegation. Paragraph 73 mentions that agents receive GPS data, monitors security status, and communicates the GPS data and security status to other agents and the GOMAC. Paragraph 78 describes fixed asset agents, which operate off facility power. Paragraph 84 mentions that the CIA is activated when cargo is loaded into a container. The agents monitor security status, and a master control unit compiles the security status of all agents, and the sends the compiled status to the GOMAC. Paragraph 98 states that reports may be generated periodically, but is silent about modifying the intervals.

Because Webb does not teach or suggest that frequency of the reporting is a function of the geographic location of the container, claim 27 and its dependent claim 28 should be allowed over Webb.

Claim 28 has been amended for clarity. Amended claim 28 recites a CSU bridge for allowing the agent to communicate with the CSU via a low-power wireless network connection.

The CSU bridge enables additional monitoring capability and allows data transmission to occur using vehicle power supply rather than using the CSU's scarce battery power. Thus, use of the CSU bridge allows battery power to be reduced even further.

A CSU bridge is not taught or suggested by Webb. The office action alleges that the CSU bridge is disclosed in paragraph 77. However, paragraph 77 only mentions the agent, pallet tracker, vessel, GOMAC, onboard master control unit, and containers. Moreover, paragraph 77 is silent about a lower power wireless network connection. For these additional reasons, claim 28 should be allowed over Webb.

New claims 29-31 recite additional features of the CSU bridge. Paragraphs 31-32 provide support for these new claims. These additional features are not taught or suggested by Web. Therefore, new claims 29-31 should be allowed over Webb.

The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to discuss any remaining issues before mailing another office action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hugh Gortler #33,890/  
Hugh P. Gortler  
Reg. No. 33,890  
(949) 454-0898  
Date: Dec. 22, 2008